

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 32-35 are objected to because of certain informalities.

These claims have been amended to remove informalities.

Double Patenting

Claims 25-26 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8 of copending Application No. 10/085,562 in view of applicant's admitted prior art fig. 6. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that as amended, claim 1 of the corresponding application is clearly distinct from claim 25 of the present application. For example, claim 25 recites the step of determining the presence of the boundary, which is not recited in claim 1 of the corresponding application. Further as to figure 6, applicants have provided explanation herein as to distinguishing aspects of claim 25. Applicants believe that claim 25 is clearly distinguishable from the cited references and request the withdrawal of the rejection of double patenting for claims 25-26.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art figs. 1-6 in view of Radi US Patent No. 6,594,327. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In response to Applicants explanation in previous response, the Examiner has stated that:

“Applicant’s arguments, see page 6 of the comment, filed on 12/19/05, have been fully considered and are not persuasive. It is alleged that the applied references does not teach the correlation of a value in a digital sample with a corresponding value in a plurality of digital samples previously received. However, it is noted that fig. 6 of applicant’s admitted prior art clearly shows a value in a digital sample is correlated with a corresponding value in a plurality digital samples previously received.” (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that there is a very clear and distinct distinguish factor between the prior art described by the Applicants and what is recited in claim 25. Applicants explained the prior art to help one skilled in the art to be able to distinguish between what is claimed and taught by the prior art. Here is how claim 25 differs from the prior art described by Applicants:

In figure 6, a value in digital sample is correlated with a corresponding value in the previously received sample; however, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to take a particular note of the comparison scheme. As shown in figure 6, sample P10 is compared with sample P9 then the sample P9 is compared with sample P8 and P8 is then compared with P7 and so on.

In contrast, Applicants request the Examiner to note the example shown in figure 7 where a sample P10 is compared with samples P9, P8, P7... P4. Thus, one sample is compared with each one of the previous samples and that is what is recited in claim 25: correlating a first value of a first digital sample with a corresponding value **in each one of a plurality of previously received digital samples**. Accordingly, claim 25 and those depend therefrom are clearly and patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Please charge any additional fees, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0668. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

/Abdul Zindani/
Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137